



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,823	06/01/2001	Tadahiko Kubota	012777-041	8408

7590 11/18/2004

Platon N. Mandros  
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

PERRY, ANTHONY T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2879	

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/870,823	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KUBOTA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Anthony T Perry	<b>Art Unit</b> 2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                                        |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

The Amendment filed on 8/20/2004, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Claim 7 has been canceled.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gotoh et al. (EP 0 910 107 A1) in view of Kawamoto et al. (JP 2000-114773).

Regarding claims 1 and 19, Gotoh et al. teach an electromagnetic-wave-shielding film comprising a transparent support (11) and a conductive layer comprising a metal thin film in the form of a mesh film (12), wherein a unit space area of the mesh film is  $.012544 \text{ mm}^2$ , which is less than two fifths of an area of a pixel of an image display device (see for example Fig. 3 and col. 1, lines 40-45). Note that any image display device with a pixel having an area that is five halves the size of the unit space area of the mesh film can be used in the comparison since the display device is not claimed. Accordingly, the pixel area of  $1.1664 \text{ mm}^2$ , as taught in US 6,295,040 is used in the comparison. Gotoh et al. do not specifically teach the mesh film comprising lattice lines which define a unit space having a shape of a pentagon, hexagon, circle, or an ellipse.

However, Kawamoto et al. teach a mesh pattern that comprises lattice lines which define at least a quadrilateral unit space and an elliptical unit space (see fig. 5). Kawamoto teaches that such a mesh pattern that comprises curved lines and a random pattern prevent Moire phenomenon from appearing to a greater extent than does a mesh film that consists of straight lines and a repeating pattern, as the one taught in the Gotoh reference (see for example paragraphs 15-16). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the mesh pattern of Gotoh providing a pattern as shown in Fig. 5 of the Kawamoto reference, in order to prevent the occurrence of Moire phenomenon, improving the display of the device.

Regarding claim 2-3, the shapes of the random mesh portions formed in the conductive layer are formed by intersecting points (see Fig. 5).

Furthermore, the Examiner notes that the recitations "obtained by shifting lattice lines of a regular lattice pattern from the original position thereof" and "located within an area defined by linking middle points between an individual intersecting point and each adjacent point thereof of the regular lattice before shifting the lattice lines" are drawn to a process of manufacturing which is incidental to the claimed apparatus. It is well established that a claimed apparatus cannot be distinguished over the prior art by a process limitation. Consequently, absent a showing of an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art, the subject product-by-process claim limitation is not afforded patentable weight (see MPEP 2113). Therefore, it is the position of the examiner that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the mesh film disclosed by Kawamoto is at least a fully functional equivalent to the Applicant's

Art Unit: 2879

claimed invention as evidenced by the Gotoh and Kawamoto combination's suggestion of all of the Applicant's claimed structural limitations.

Combination provided in the rejection of claim 1 applies.

Regarding claim 4, the Gotoh reference teaches that the mesh film formed from the metal thin film is formed by etching using a photolithography method (see for example col. 5, lines 24-32).

Regarding claim 5, Gotoh et al. teach that the lattice lines each have a width of 15 micrometers (see Fig. 3).

Regarding claim 6, Gotoh et al. teach that the lattice lines have a thickness of 0.1 micrometers (see for example col. 5, lines 24-26).

Regarding claim 8, Gotoh and Kawamoto do not specifically state that the film is subjected to blackening. However, it is well known in the art to blacken the metal thin film so as to remove the color of the metal and to prevent reflection. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to blacken the mesh film so as to prevent reflection providing a better contrast to the display device.

Regarding claim 9, Gotoh and Kawamoto do not specifically state the use of an infrared-ray cutting layer containing a dye that absorbs light in an infrared-ray range. However, it is well known in the art to provide such a dye so as to block heat-rays (infrared-rays) so as to block the internal components of the display device from external heat. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to provide such a dye so as to block heat-rays (infrared-rays) so as to protect the display device and its components from external heat.

Regarding claim 10, Gotoh teaches that the electromagnetic-wave-shielding film contains a dye that absorbs light in a visible range (see for example col. 5, lines 8-15).

Regarding claim 11, Gotoh et al. teach a method of producing an electromagnetic-wave-shielding film comprising a transparent support (11) and a conductive layer comprising a metal thin film in the form of a mesh film (12), wherein a unit space area of the mesh film is  $.012544 \text{ mm}^2$ , which is less than two fifths of an area of a pixel of an image display device (see for example Fig. 3 and col. 1, lines 40-45). Note that any image display device with a pixel having an area that is five halves the size of the unit space area of the mesh film can be used in the comparison since the display device is not claimed. Accordingly, the pixel area of  $1.1664 \text{ mm}^2$ , as taught in US 6,295,040 is used in the comparison. Gotoh et al. do not specifically teach the mesh film comprising lattice lines which define a unit space having a shape of a pentagon, hexagon, circle, or an ellipse.

However, Kawamoto et al. teach a mesh pattern that comprises lattice lines which define at least a quadrilateral unit space and an elliptical unit space (see fig. 5). Kawamoto teaches that such a mesh pattern that comprises curved lines and a random pattern prevent Moire phenomenon from appearing to a greater extent than does a mesh film that consists of straight lines and a repeating pattern, as the one taught in the Gotoh reference (see for example paragraphs 15-16). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the mesh pattern of Gotoh providing a pattern as shown in Fig. 5 of the Kawamoto reference, in order to prevent the occurrence of Moire phenomenon, improving the display of the device.

Art Unit: 2879

Regarding claim 12, the Gotoh and Kawamoto reference do not specifically state that the random mesh portions are obtained by shifting lattice lines of a regular lattice pattern from the original position thereof. However, it is noted that the applicant's specific limitation of the random mesh portions being formed by shifting the lattice lines of a regular lattice pattern from the original position thereof, does not solve any of the stated problems or yield any unexpected result that is not within the scope of the teachings applied. Therefore it is considered to be a matter of choice, which a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious to select any known method (screen printing, electroless plating, a photolithography method, shifting lattice lines of a regular lattice pattern) of forming the random mesh portions as long as they do not form a repeating pattern and comprise at least a quadrilateral unit space and an elliptical unit space.

Regarding claim 13, the Gotoh reference teaches that the mesh film is formed from the metal thin film by electroless plating (see for example col. 5, lines 24-25).

Regarding claim 14, the Gotoh reference teaches that the mesh film formed from the metal thin film is formed by etching using a photolithography method (see for example col. 5, lines 24-32).

Claims 15-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nhan et al. (US 6,295,040) in view of Gotoh et al. (EP 0 910 107 A1) further in view of Kawamoto et al. (JP 2000-114773).

Regarding claims 15-16 and 20, Nhan et al. teach an image display device that has a pixel area of  $1.1664^2$  mm. Nhan et al. does not teach the use of an electromagnetic-wave-shielding film.

However, Gotoh et al. teach the use of an electromagnetic-wave-shielding film comprising a transparent support (11) and a conductive layer comprising a metal thin film in the form of a mesh film (12), wherein a unit space area of the mesh film is  $.012544 \text{ mm}^2$  (see for example Fig. 3 and col. 1, lines 40-45). Gotoh teaches that a mesh film having a line width of 15 micrometers and line intervals of 127 micrometers (unit space area of  $0.012544 \text{ mm}^2$ ) prevents electromagnetic waves from leaking (see for example col. 1, lines 40-45 and col. 5, lines 32-39). Gotoh et al. teach that such an electromagnetic-wave-shielding film prevents electromagnetic waves from leaking out and interfering with the image light (see for example col. 1, lines 5-45). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the PDP of Nhan with an electromagnetic-wave-shielding film taught by Gotoh in order to reduce leakage of the electromagnetic waves providing a more accurate image. Gotoh et al. do not specifically teach the mesh film comprising lattice lines which define a unit space having a shape of a pentagon, hexagon, circle, or an ellipse.

However, Kawamoto et al. teach a mesh pattern that comprises lattice lines which define at least a quadrilateral unit space and an elliptical unit space (see fig. 5). Kawamoto teaches that such a mesh pattern that comprises curved lines and a random pattern prevent Moire phenomenon from appearing to a greater extent than does a mesh film that consists of straight lines and a repeating pattern, as the one taught in the Gotoh reference (see for example paragraphs 15-16). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the mesh pattern of Gotoh providing a pattern as shown in Fig. 5 of the Kawamoto reference, in order to prevent the occurrence of Moire phenomenon, improving the display of the device.



The shapes of the random mesh portions formed in the conductive layer are formed by intersecting points (see Fig. 5).

Furthermore, the Examiner notes that the recitations “obtained by shifting lattice lines of a regular lattice pattern from the original position thereof” and “located within an area defined by linking middle points between an individual intersecting point and each adjacent point thereof of the regular lattice before shifting the lattice lines” are drawn to a process of manufacturing which is incidental to the claimed apparatus. It is well established that a claimed apparatus cannot be distinguished over the prior art by a process limitation. Consequently, absent a showing of an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art, the subject product-by-process claim limitation is not afforded patentable weight (see MPEP 2113). Therefore, it is the position of the examiner that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the mesh film disclosed by Kawamoto is at least a fully functional equivalent to the Applicant’s claimed invention as evidenced by the Nhan-Gotoh-Kawamoto combination’s suggestion of all of the Applicant’s claimed structural limitations.

Regarding claim 17, Nhan, Gotoh, and Kawamoto do not specifically state the use of an infrared-ray cutting layer containing a dye that absorbs light in an infrared-ray range. However, it is well known in the art to provide such a dye so as to block heat-rays (infrared-rays) so as to block the internal components of the display device from external heat. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to provide such a dye so as to block heat-rays (infrared-rays) so as to protect the display device and its components from external heat.

Regarding claim 18, Gotoh teaches that the electromagnet-wave-shielding film is mounted to the front surface of the PDP.

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Other Prior Art Cited*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

JP 2001-22283 teaches a mesh electromagnetic-wave-shielding film wherein the unit space area of the mesh is one sixth of the area of a pixel.

### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to *Anthony Perry* whose telephone number is **(571) 272-2459**. The examiner can normally be reached between the hours of 9:00AM to 5:30PM Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel, can be reached on (571) 272-24597. **The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.**

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [Anthony.perry@uspto.gov].


Art Unit: 2879

*All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.*

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Anthony Perry  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2879  
November 14, 2004

  
Sor

Vip Patel  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2879